

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **26 July 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, and 21. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chaudhuri et al. (USPN 7,194,451, hereinafter “Chaudhuri”), in view of Chidlovskii (USPN 6,347,314, hereinafter “Chidlovskii”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chaudhuri in view of Chidlovskii. More specifically, Examiner argued that that following language from claim 1 is obvious in light of Chidlovskii:

initializing a signature cache, wherein initializing the signature cache involves trapping database queries in a controlled environment, parsing the database queries to produce a set of valid signatures, and storing the valid signatures in the signature cache (see claim 1, lines 3-6)

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Chidlovskii is limited to caching the results of web queries (i.e., a **web search entered in a web browser**) in order to enable a system to reuse the results with subsequent similar web queries (see Chidlovskii, col. 2, lines 24-33). Nothing within Chidlovskii suggests trapping database queries in a controlled environment, parsing the database queries to produce a set of valid signatures, and storing the valid signatures in the signature cache.

More specifically, Chidlovskii discloses:

[Within the system, each] cache includes, for each of a set of one or more semantic regions, contents with one or more items of data. The technique responds to a query by obtaining a query signature and by **using the query signature and region signatures for at least one of the semantic regions in finding one or more semantic regions that are qualified and**

using the contents of at least one of the qualified regions to obtaining an answer to the query (see Chidlovskii, col. 2, lines 24-33).

In other words, the Chidlovskii system caches the results of web queries along with the binary strings that identify the terms in the web queries that generated the corresponding results (see Chidlovskii, col. 2, lines 47-50). The system then compares a binary string generated from the terms in a subsequently received web query to the binary strings that identify cached web queries in order to determine if the system has cached web query results that can be used to more quickly satisfy the web query (see Chidlovskii, col. 2, lines 27-33).

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention provide security for a database by comparing the signature of a received database query with a set of signatures for known-valid database queries and generating an alert for mismatching database queries (see instant application, claim 1 and FIG. 6). In order to generate the signatures for known-valid database queries, the system initializes a signature cache by: (1) **trapping database queries in a controlled environment**; (2) **parsing the database queries to produce a set of valid signatures**; and (3) storing the valid signatures in the signature cache (see instant application, claim 1, pars. [0041]-[0042], and FIG. 5).

Applicant respectfully points out that Chidlovskii discloses a system for caching web query results according to the terms in the web query that returned the results and searching the cached results in order to more quickly return results for subsequent web queries. Nothing within Chidlovskii suggests trapping database queries in a controlled environment, parsing the database queries to produce a set of valid signatures, and storing the valid signatures in the signature cache.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims of 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chaudhuri in view of Chidlovskii is inapposite and has no basis. Applicant therefore

requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant further submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-5 and 7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-12 and 14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-19 and 21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony P. Jones/
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 24 August 2007

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com